

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 12 and 22 are amended. Claims 1-33 are pending for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections and requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

**§ 112 Rejections**

Claims 11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office states that it is unclear whether these claims are dependent or independent claims because claims 1 and 12 are method claims and claims 11 and 20, which depend respectively from these claims, are storage medium claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not indefinite. Specifically, **claim 11** recites *a computer system* comprising:

*a storage medium* having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions; and

*an execution unit*, coupled to the storage medium, *to execute at least a subset of the plurality of executable instructions to implement a method according to claim 1.*

Thus, this claim is directed to an apparatus that comprises instructions on a storage medium that are executable to implement the method of claim 1.

**Claim 20** recites a storage medium with executable instructions which implement the method of claim 12.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing indefinite about these claims.

1 The Patent Office apparently agrees with this assertion as evidenced by the  
2 results of a cursory search of the PTO database which uncovered a number of  
3 issued patents with claims written in the form objected to by the Office.  
4 Specifically, consider U.S. Patent Nos. 6,725,262, 6,716,102, and 6,674,918  
5 exemplary claims of which are reproduced just below.

6  
7 **6,725,262**

8  
9 26. A computer-implemented method of synchronizing a  
10 configuration of resources on a plurality of computing devices comprising:  
11 generating a set of lists that describes a configuration of resources  
12 that each of a plurality of computing devices should have in order to be  
13 synchronized with one another, the configuration of resources defining the  
14 content and the settings for each of the computing devices;  
15 sending the set of lists to each of the computing devices;  
16 receiving a response from one or more of the computing devices,  
17 each response requesting data that is needed in order to synchronize the  
18 configuration of resources for the corresponding computing device;  
19 evaluating the response to determine what data is needed by a  
20 particular computing device to synchronize its resources; and  
21 sending the data that is needed by the particular computing device to  
22 the computing device so that it can synchronize its resources.

23  
24 33. *One or more computer-readable media* having computer-  
25 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer,  
implement the method of claim 26.

Here, claim 26 recites a computer-implemented method. Claim 33, which  
depends from claim 26, recites one or more computer-readable media with  
instructions which, when executed, implement the method of claim 26.

1                   **6,716,102**

2  
3                   27. A method comprising:  
4                   receiving a request to save a game being executed by a gaming  
5                   system;  
6                   saving a graphic representation of the saved game;  
7                   saving a descriptive name of the saved game; and  
8                   saving a date and time that the game was saved.

9  
10                  ***34. One or more computer-readable media*** comprising computer-  
11                  executable instructions that, when executed, perform the method as recited  
12                  in claim 27.

13  
14                  Here, claim 27 recites a method. Claim 34, which depends from claim 27,  
15                  recites one or more computer-readable media with instructions which, when  
16                  executed, perform the method of claim 27.

17                   **6,674,918**

18                   1. A computer-implemented method of synthesizing an image from  
19                   at least two other images comprising:  
20                   acquiring a first image that serves as a color source for a resultant  
21                   image which is to be formed;  
22                   acquiring a second image which serves as a perturbation source for  
23                   the first image;  
24                   operating upon a plane that represents the first image by angularly  
25                   perturbing vectors associated with the plane that represents the first image  
as a function of aspects of the second image to provide a perturbed image;  
and  
applying an illumination model to the perturbed image to provide a  
resultant synthesized image.

                  9. One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable  
instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, implement the  
method of claim 1.

1 Here, claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method. Claim 9, which  
2 depends from claim 1, recites one or more computer-readable media with  
3 instructions which, when executed, perform the method of claim 1.

4 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing indefinite  
5 about these claims. As the Patent Office appears to agree with this assertion,  
6 Applicant respectfully traverses the Offices rejection.

7  
8 **§ 103 Rejections**

9 Claims 1, 10, 11 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S.  
10 Patent No. 6,226,642 to Beranek et al. (hereinafter “Beranek”) in view of U.S.  
11 Patent No. 6,510,458 to Berstis et al. (hereinafter “Berstis”).

12 Claims 2-9, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek  
13 in view of Berstis in further view Patent Application Publication No. US  
14 2003/0018506 A1 to McLean et al. (hereinafter “McLean”) and U.S. Patent No.  
15 6,253,288 to McAllister.

16 Claims 12, 13, 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek.

17 Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek in view of  
18 EP Application No. 0 939 516 A2 to Robinson.

19 Claims 23-28 and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over  
20 Beranek in view of Robinson in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,961,602 to  
21 Thompson et al. (hereinafter “Thompson”) and McLean.

22 Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beranek in view of  
23 Robinson in further view of Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0026507  
24 A1 to Sears et al. (hereinafter “Sears”).  
25

1 Before discussing the substance of the Office's rejections, the following  
2 discussion of Applicant's disclosure and the Beranek reference is provided in an  
3 attempt to assist the Office in appreciating the patentable distinctions between  
4 Applicant's claimed embodiments and the cited references.

#### 5 6 Applicant's Disclosure

7 Applicant's disclosure, as such pertains to the claimed subject matter,  
8 concerns a system and related interfaces supporting the processing of media  
9 content. In accordance with various embodiments, a method for processing a  
10 *development project* comprises generating a *source chain* for use in a development  
11 project, and *caching the source chain* when it is not currently required in the  
12 development project. As execution of the development project continues, or  
13 during a subsequent project, if the source processing chain is required, it is  
14 retrieved from cache, modified as necessary to meet the needs of the development  
15 project, and integrated into the development project.

16 With respect to *development projects* and *source chains*, consider the  
17 following. Source processing chains or source chains (also referred to as *filter*  
18 *graphs*), can comprise different types of filters, e.g. source filters, transform  
19 filters, and rendering filters. A source filter is typically used to load data from  
20 some source; a transform filter processes and passes data; and a rendering filter  
21 renders data to a hardware device or other locations (e.g., saved to a file, etc.).  
22 An example of a filter graph or source processing chain for a simplistic media  
23 rendering process is shown Fig. 1.

24 The illustrated source chain is comprised of a plurality of filters 102-114,  
25 which read, process (transform) and render media content from a selected source

1 file. As shown, the filter graph includes each of the types of filters described  
2 above, interconnected in a linear fashion. Filter graphs, such as the one shown in  
3 Fig. 1, can typically be used in the context of user-defined development projects  
4 such as multi-media editing projects.

5 As additional context with respect to user-defined development projects,  
6 consider the following in connection with Figs. 9 and 10, which shows a user-  
7 defined editing project in accordance with embodiments described in the  
8 specification. In this example, when a user creates an editing or development  
9 project, they can select from a number of different multimedia clips that they can  
10 then assemble into a unique presentation. Each individual clip represents a *source*  
11 of digital data or a source stream (e.g., multimedia content). Projects can include  
12 one or more sources 902. In defining their project, a user can operate on sources  
13 in different ways. For example, video sources can have *transitions* 904 and *effects*  
14 906 applied on them. A transition object is a way to change between two or more  
15 sources. A transition essentially receives as input, two or more streams, operates  
16 on them in some way, and produces a single output stream. An exemplary  
17 transition can comprise, for example, fading from one source to another. An effect  
18 object can operate on a single source or on a composite of sources. An effect  
19 essentially receives a single input stream, operates on it in some way, and  
20 produces a single output stream. An exemplary effect can comprise a black-and-  
21 white effect in which a video stream that is configured for presentation in color  
22 format is rendered into a video stream that is configured for presentation in black  
23 and white format. Effect object 906 may actually perform multiple tasks on the  
24 received input stream.  
25

1       An exemplary user interface 908 is shown and represents what a user might  
2 see when they produce a multimedia project with software executing on a  
3 computer. In this example, the user has selected three sources A, B, and C, and  
4 has assembled the sources into a project timeline. The project timeline defines  
5 when the individual sources are to be rendered, as well as when any transitions  
6 and/or effects are to occur.

7       As noted in the specification, conventional implementations of a filter  
8 graph manager required a source processing chain be constructed for each access  
9 to a source. Thus, a literal implementation of the dynamic graph building feature  
10 introduced in the specification might well have the adverse affect of requiring that  
11 multiple accesses to a source would require that a commensurate number of  
12 processing chains be constructed, i.e., one for each time the filter string was  
13 dynamically added to the filter graph. As described in the specification,  
14 performance improvements may be achieved by reducing the number of times a  
15 processing chain or filter graph is created to retrieve media content from a  
16 particular source.

17       In accordance with at least some embodiments, filter chains can be cached  
18 for subsequent use within a development project (e.g. later in the execution of the  
19 filter graph) and for use across development projects.

### 20 21       **The Beranek Reference**

22       Beranek is directed to method of controlling how a Web document is  
23 presented for display on a browser of a Web appliance. The Web appliance  
24 typically includes a television class monitor. The Web document typically is  
25 formatted according to a markup language such as HTML and the method uses a

1 client side HTTP caching proxy to intercept the Web document and then  
2 dynamically rewrite the document before it is displayed on the browser of the Web  
3 appliance. In particular, as the Web document is received from the server, the  
4 HTML is parsed to identify the format of the document and the information  
5 therein. A filter mechanism is then used to reformat the Web document according  
6 to some given protocol, and the re-formatted Web document is then passed to the  
7 browser for display on the monitor. As Beranek instructs, dynamic alteration of  
8 the HTML in this manner enables control of the "look and feel" of the browser  
9 display irrespective of the monitor resolution and/or quality.

10 At this point, and in view of the discussion of Applicant's disclosure above,  
11 what should begin to emerge is an understanding that Applicant's disclosure (and  
12 claimed embodiments) and the systems and methods in Beranek are really two  
13 very different things, as will become apparent in the discussion below.

#### 14 15 **Examiner's Traversal of Applicant's Previous Arguments**

16 In the present Office Action, the Examiner responded to Applicant's  
17 previous arguments. The Examiner noted, in paragraph 56, that some of the  
18 substance of Applicant's arguments did not appear in the language of the claims.  
19 Specifically, the Examiner noted that features such as *source processing chains*  
20 *processing and rendering media content* did not appear in the claims.

21 Applicant maintains its position with respect to Beranek as articulated in  
22 the previously-filed response. Nonetheless, independent claims 1, 12 and 22 have  
23 been amended in an attempt to clarify the claimed subject matter, as will become  
24 apparent below.



## The §103 Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended and recites a method comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- loading one or more source processing chains to support execution of a development project, *the source processing chains comprising a series of filters to process and render media content*; and
- determining whether each of the one or more processing chains will be subsequently required during execution of this or another development project and, if so, caching those filter chains which will be subsequently required.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Beranek teaches one or more processing chains (referring to a Web document and citing to column 2, lines 25-50; column 9, lines 7-47; and column 10, lines 21-67). The Office also argues that Beranek teaches a development project (referring to the browser and citing to column 10, lines 21-67; column 2, lines 25-50; and column 13, lines 40-67). The Office also argues that Beranek teaches processing chains (referring to data streams and citing to column 13, lines 40-67). The Office also argues that Beranek teaches execution of development projects citing to column 2, lines 19-53.

Applicant very respectfully disagrees with the Office's interpretation of Beranek and its application to the presently claimed subject matter. Specifically, nowhere does Beranek even remotely disclose or suggest "source processing chains" as that term is utilized in the claims and defined in the specification. Specifically, in the discussion above under the heading "Applicant's Disclosure", Applicant points out, for contextual purposes, characteristics that are associated with exemplary source processing chains. Applicant very respectfully submits

1 that a “web document” is not a “source processing chain”. Nonetheless, claim 1  
2 has been amended to recite that the source processing chains comprise *a series of*  
3 *filters to process and render media content*.

4 Beranek simply fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter that the  
5 Office argues it does. Hence, for at least this reason, the Office has failed to  
6 establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable.

7 The Office then admits that Beranek does not teach caching filter chains.  
8 Applicant must necessarily agree because Beranek does not, in fact, even remotely  
9 suggest filter chains as that term is utilized in the specification. The Office then  
10 relies on Berstis and argues that Berstis teaches filtering web pages to determine  
11 when the web pages are saved to the cache. Applicant must very respectfully  
12 again point out that “source processing chains” are not “web documents”. This  
13 notion has been clarified by the amendment to this claim. Thus, to this extent,  
14 Berstis’s teachings are simply irrelevant. Hence, for at least this additional reason,  
15 this claim is allowable as the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of  
16 obviousness.

17 **Claims 2-11** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an  
18 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
19 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed  
20 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
21 another. Given the allowability of these claims in view of the misinterpretation  
22 and application of Beranek and Berstis, the rejections based on the further  
23 combinations with McLean and McAllister are not seen to add anything of  
24 significance.

1           **Claim 12** has been amended and recites a method comprising [added  
2 language appears in bold italics]:

- 3           • generating a source chain for use in a development project, *the*  
4           *source chain comprising a series of filters to process and render*  
5           *media content*; and
- 6           • caching the source chain when it is not currently required in the  
7           development project.

8           In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies solely upon  
9 Beranek and argues that it discloses source chains and development projects as  
10 those terms are utilized in the specification. As noted above, Applicant very  
11 respectfully disagrees with the Office and submits that the Office has  
12 misinterpreted Beranek. Specifically, Beranek's web documents and browser are  
13 simply not, respectively, "source chains" and "development projects", as those  
14 terms are defined in the claims and specification. Nonetheless, this claim has been  
15 amended to clarify that the source chain *comprises a series of filters to process*  
16 *and render media content*.

17           Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of  
18 obviousness and this claim is allowable.

19           **Claims 13-21** depend from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from  
20 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
21 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed  
22 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
23 another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims in view of the  
24 misinterpretation and application of Beranek, the rejections based on the further  
25

1 combinations with McLean and McAllister are not seen to add anything of  
2 significance.

3 **Claim 22** has been amended and recites a system comprising [added  
4 language appears in bold italics]:

- 5 • a plurality of sources; and
- 6 • an interface, selectively coupled to the plurality of sources, to  
7 generate and implement a development project of processing chains,  
8 wherein the interface loads a processing chain for each of the  
9 plurality of media sources at a point during the execution of the  
10 project when the chain is required, and wherein the interface is  
11 configured to unload at least a subset of the chains when they are not  
12 required, ***the processing chains comprising a series of filters to  
13 process and render media content.***

12 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Beranek  
13 discloses processing chains (citing to Beranek's web documents) and a  
14 development project (citing to Beranek's browser). As noted above, this is simply  
15 not the case. For reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the  
16 Office has misinterpreted and misapplied Beranek. Specifically, Beranek's web  
17 documents are not processing chains. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended this  
18 claim to clarify that the ***processing chains comprise a series of filters to process  
19 and render media content.***

20 Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of  
21 obviousness and this claim is allowable. In view of the Office's misinterpretation  
22 of Beranek, the rejection of this claim based on the combination with Robinson is  
23 not seen to add anything of significance.

1       **Claims 23-33** depend from claim 22 and are allowable as depending from  
2 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
3 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 22, are neither disclosed  
4 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
5 another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims in view of the  
6 misinterpretation and application of Beranek, the rejections based on the further  
7 combinations with Thompson, McLean, Anderson, Sears and McAllister are not  
8 seen to add anything of significance.

9  
10       **Conclusion**

11       All of the claims are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully  
12 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. In the event that the  
13 Office's next action is anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,  
14 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned be contacted for the purpose  
15 of scheduling an interview.

16  
17  
18       Dated: 8/30/04

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256